

PTO/SB/21 (09-04)

Approved for use through 07/31/2006. OMB 0651-0031

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

**TRANSMITTAL
FORM**

(to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)

Total Number of Pages in This Submission

4

Application Number

10/707148

Filing Date

11-24-2003

First Named Inventor

CHABOT

Art Unit

3761

Examiner Name

GARCIA

Attorney Docket Number

6536-0301

ENCLOSURES (Check all that apply)☐

Fee Transmittal Form

☐

Fee Attached

☐

Amendment/Reply

☐

After Final

☐

Affidavits/declaration(s)

☐

Extension of Time Request

☐

Express Abandonment Request

☐

Information Disclosure Statement

☐

Certified Copy of Priority Document(s)

☐Reply to Missing Parts/
Incomplete Application☐Reply to Missing Parts
under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53☐

Drawing(s)

☐

Licensing-related Papers

☐

Petition

☐Petition to Convert to a
Provisional Application☐Power of Attorney, Revocation
Change of Correspondence Address☐

Terminal Disclaimer

☐

Request for Refund

☐

CD, Number of CD(s) _____

☐

Landscape Table on CD

☐

After Allowance Communication to TC

☐Appeal Communication to Board
of Appeals and Interferences☒Appeal Communication to TC
(Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief)☐

Proprietary Information

☐

Status Letter

☐Other Enclosure(s) (please identify
below):**Remarks**

Please be advised that the pending application has had a Petition to Make Special granted on November 3, 2005. Applicant respectfully requests the Board to handle this appeal on a special basis.

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT

Firm Name

Chabot & Associates

Signature

Printed name

Ralph D. Chabot

Date

01-31-2006

Reg. No.

39,133

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below:

Signature

Typed or printed name

Ralph D. Chabot

Date

01-31-2006

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to 2 hours to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.



Attorney Docket No: 6536-0301

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

In re Application of: Chabot
Serial No: 10/707148
Filed: November 24, 2003
Art Unit: 3679
Examiner: Ernesto Garcia
For: Method for Limiting the Movement of an Infant in a Particular Direction

REPLY BRIEF

This paper is in response to the Examiner's Answer mailed January 11, 2006.

Introduction

A petition to make special was filed for the application on appeal. A decision granting the petition was made November 3, 2005. Applicant respectfully asks the Board to handle this appeal on a special basis.

Applicant's reply to the examiner's two grounds of rejection are presented below.

1. Rejections based on Section 112, 2nd paragraph

As in the prosecution stage, the examiner's answer continues to rely on his unsupported opinion rather than objective reasoning and legal precedent. Applicant's arguments, supported by case law were not addressed.

On page 6 of the examiner's answer, the examiner restates his rejection based on section 112, 2nd paragraph that there is no standardized depth which prevents an infant from attempting to cross while still allowing older children and adults to step across. The examiner completely fails to address appellant's argument that: a) breadth is not indefiniteness, *In re Robins*, 166 USPQ 552 (CCPA 1970); and, b) that the pending claims must be given the broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification. MPEP§2173.05(a).

For the reasons cited in the Amended Appeal Brief, the Board is respectfully asked to withdraw the examiner's rejection for pending claims 6, 9 and 10.

2. Rejections based on Section 102

On page 7 of the examiner's answer, he dismisses the relevance of the *Ex parte Pfeiffer* case stating that it was not relied upon to reject the claims. This is a bewildering position, given that it was the examiner himself who cited the case in response to Applicant's inquiry to the legal basis for rejection. (See Paragraph B, Page 2, "Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief" mailed 05/26/2005).

The examiner clings to the proposition that steps rather than structure serve to define method claims. Even if true, the steps presented are different. For example, claim 2 includes the step of "positioning said sheeting material to prevent movement of the infant from one area of a house to another". The Marshall reference does not speak to preventing movement of an infant and does not describe a use for inside a house. Anticipation requires identity of invention. The claimed invention, as described in the claims, must be the same as that of the reference in order to anticipate. *Glaverbel Societe Anonume v. Northlake Marketing & Supply Inc.*, 45 F.3d 1550, 33 USPQ 2d 1496, 1498 (Fed. Cir. 1995). Clearly, the Marshall reference does not anticipate the claims on appeal.

The examiner also states in page 7 that the pending specification states the invention could as well be used with dogs (citing paragraph 004), concluding this is clear evidence the method described in the Marshall prior art reference equally applies to the claimed invention. The examiner's statement is respectfully misleading.

The pertinent part of Paragraph 004 reads: "My method can also be used for small domesticated pets *such as small dogs*". (Emphasis added). Use of the term "small dogs" should be interpreted to mean that it excludes large dogs. Applicant's attorney is unaware of an instance and thus does not believe that small dogs such as Yorkshire terriers and Chihuahuas even possess the leverage necessary to knock over the garbage can presented in Marshall. Therefore, if small dogs do not possess the physical characteristics to knock over a garbage can, then Marshall's invention does not relate to


small dogs. Nevertheless, the examiner's argument is irrelevant since the claims pending on appeal are directed to limiting the movement of an infant in a particular direction and do not claim a method to prevent movement of dogs.

Accordingly, since the Marshall reference does not include all the limitations of the pending claims, the rejection based on anticipation is incorrect.

The Board is respectfully asked to withdraw the examiner's rejection for pending claims 2-10.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 31, 2006


Ralph D. Chabot
Reg. No. 39,133